



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/741,306	12/19/2003	Michael Wengrovitz	134132	4396
77216	7590	03/18/2009		
ALCATEL-LUCENT C/O GALASSO & ASSOCIATES, LP P. O. BOX 26503 AUSTIN, TX 78755-0503			EXAMINER RUTKOWSKI, JEFFREY M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2419	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/18/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/741,306

Applicant(s)

WENGROVITZ ET AL.

Examiner

JEFFREY M. RUTKOWSKI

Art Unit

2419

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 December 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 and 13-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 and 13-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-8508)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 6-12 have been cancelled.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the first and second paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. **Claims 1-5** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. The specification does not adequately describe how the feature of "...redirecting the media to the first device..." is implemented.
3. **Claims 1-5 and 13-19** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The original specification does not adequately describe what constitutes an IP set.
4. **Claims 1-5 and 13-19** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which

applicant regards as the invention. It is unclear what is meant by a "...logical IP set..." in independent **claims 1 and 13**.

5. For **claims 1-5**, it is unclear what is meant by "...redirecting the media to the first device." The redirection feature appears to imply that information destined for any of the media devices will always be sent to the first device, in the set of one or more devices.

6. For **claims 1-5 and 14-16**, it is unclear what is meant by the word "redirecting" in the phrases "...redirecting the media to the first device..." and "...redirecting the media to the second communication port..." (Emphasis added) in **claims 1 and 14**.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35

U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

8. Claims **1-5** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gallant (US 2002/0131575) in view of Bhat et al. (US Pat 7,058,082), hereinafter referred to as Bhat, and the Admitted Prior Art, hereinafter referred to as the APA.

9. **Regarding claim 1**, Gallant teaches a server (see Fig. 4 Box 22) coupled to the voice switch (see Fig. 4 Box 14) and the network of one or more first devices (see Fig. 4 Box 18), the server maintaining for at least one of the first devices a logical device adhering to the first protocol (see Fig. 4 Box 22), the server further receiving media directed to the logical device and redirecting the media to the first device (see Fig. 4 Box 30). .

Gallant does not disclose maintaining a logical IP set for each device. Bhat discloses an architecture where a separate state machine (logical entity) is maintained for each device that is involved in a call [col. 25 lines 50-55, figure 25A]. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use Bhat's state machines in Gallant's invention to maintain information pertaining to a call [Bhat, col. 25 lines 25-27].

The combination of Gallant and Bhat disclose maintaining a separate state machine for each device involved in a call. The combination of Gallant and Bhat does not disclose the use of IP sets. The APA discloses that IP sets are well-known in the art [Specification, page 9 lines 19-23]. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use IP sets in Gallant's invention to make use of well established technology.

10. **Regarding claim 2**, the combination of Gallant, Bhat and the APA disclose the use of IP sets. Gallant further teaches the server further translates media transmitted to the logical IP set according to the first protocol to media adhering to the second protocol (see paragraph 31 lines 16-18), the media adhering to the second protocol being redirected to the first device (see paragraph 34 lines 1-4).

11. **Regarding claim 3**, Gallant further teaches where the first protocol is a private signaling and voice protocol (see paragraph 30 lines 5-9).

12. **Regarding claim 4**, Gallant further teaches where the second protocol is a session initiation protocol (see paragraph 30 lines 5-9).
13. **Regarding claim 5**, the combination of Gallant, Bhat and the APA disclose the use of IP sets. Gallant further teaches the server stores a mapping of an address associated with the logical IP set with an address associated with the first device (see paragraph 34 lines 1-4).
14. Claims **13-19** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Young et al. (US 2003/0093563) in view of Bhat and the APA.
15. **Regarding claim 13**, Young teaches receiving from the voice switch a first message indicative of a first communication port to be used by a particular device for receiving media (see paragraph 77 lines 1-5); receiving from the particular device a second message indicative of a second communication port to be used by the particular device for receiving media (see paragraph 76 lines 1-7); and reconciling a difference between the first communication port and the second communication port (see paragraph 80 lines 1-6).

Young does not disclose maintaining a logical IP set for each device. Bhat discloses an architecture where a separate state machine (logical entity) is maintained for each device that is involved in a call [**col. 25 lines 50-55, figure 25A**]. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use Bhat's state machines in Young's invention to maintain information pertaining to a call [**Bhat, col. 25 lines 25-27**].

The combination of Young and Bhat disclose maintaining a separate state machine for each device involved in a call. The combination of Gallant and Bhat does not disclose the use of IP sets. The APA discloses that IP sets are well-known in the art [**Specification, page 9 lines**

19-23]. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use IP sets in Gallant's invention to make use of well established technology.

16. **Regarding claim 14**, Young further teaches mapping the first communication port to the second communication port (see paragraph 75 lines 7-12); receiving media addressed to the first communication port; and redirecting the media to the second communication port (see paragraph 75 lines 7-12).

17. **Regarding claim 15**, Young further teaches where the mapping statically allocates the first communication port to the second communication port (see paragraph 80 lines 1-7).

18. **Regarding claim 16**, Young further teaches where the mapping dynamically allocates the first communication port to the second communication port (see paragraph 80 lines 1-7).

19. **Regarding claim 17**, Young further teaches translating media transmitted to the first communication port according to the first protocol to media adhering to the second protocol (see paragraph 82 lines 1-6), where the redirecting of the media comprises redirecting the media adhering to the second protocol to the second communication port (see paragraph 77 lines 1-5).

20. **Regarding claim 18**, Young further teaches where the first protocol is a private signaling and voice protocol (see paragraph 82 lines 1-6).

21. **Regarding claim 19**, Young further teaches where the second protocol is a session initiation protocol (see paragraph 82 lines 1-6).

Response to Arguments

22. The argument with respect to the feature of "redirecting the media to the first device" is not persuasive. The cited portion of the application does not disclose how the redirection is performed.

23. Applicant's arguments filed 12/09/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive, for the reasons stated above.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JEFFREY M. RUTKOWSKI whose telephone number is (571)270-1215. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 7:30-5:00 PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hassan Kizou can be reached on (571) 272-3088. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Jeffrey M Rutkowski
Patent Examiner
03/05/2009

/Hassan Kizou/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2419